

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SM

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/429,446 10/28/99 GRAHAM

L SEM4492P0771

 026389

IM22/0913

CHRISTENSEN, O CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE WA 98101-2347 EXAMINER LEADER, W ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER*16*

1741

DATE MAILED:

09/13/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/429,446	Applicant(s)	Graham et al
Examiner	William Leader	Group Art Unit	1741

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/20/01, 8/20/01.

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 15-34 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 15-34 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____ Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1741

On June 20, 2001, applicant submitted a Request for Filing Continued Prosecution Application under 37 CFR 1.53(d). On June 28, 2001, a Notice to File Missing Parts of Application (CPA) was mailed to applicant. Receipt of applicant's August 20, 2001, Transmittal of Missing Parts of Patent Application is hereby acknowledged.

The request for filing a CPA specified that claims 1-14 and 35-43, which were directed to non-elected inventions, be canceled. The request was not accompanied by any amendment of the remaining claims. Consequently, claims 15-34 remain as they were when previously considered, and are subject to the grounds of rejection set forth in the office action mailed on March 27, 2001. For convenience, these repeated below.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any

Art Unit: 1741

inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorne et al (6,132,587) in view of Inoue et al (5,556,814) or Farooq et al (5,549,808), and further in view of Reid et al (6,074,544), Shue et al (6,140,241) or the Lowenheim text, *Electroplating*.

The Jorne et al patent discloses a process for uniformly electroplating a metal onto a semiconductor wafer. As shown in figure 1, the wafer 1 is held face down opposite anode 2 and brought into contact with electroplating solution which is circulated to the electroplating chamber by pump 26. Power is applied to the wafer by contacts 9. Jorne et al disclose that copper may be electroplated (column 2, lines 63-65).

The process of claim 1 differs from that of Jorne et al by reciting that the electroplating solution includes ions and/or complexes of a noble metal that is to be plated, and by reciting use of a low current density for a first time period and a higher current density for a second time period.

Art Unit: 1741

The Inoue et al patent is directed to forming wiring for integrated circuits on a semiconductor wafer by electroplating. The electroplated metal may be copper, gold, platinum or palladium (column 6, lines 34-38).

The Farooq et al patent is directed to the formation of electrical interconnections on a semiconductor substrate. Copper may be electroplated onto the substrate (column 4, lines 21-23). The copper interconnect is capped with a different metal by electroplating. The capping metal may be gold, silver platinum or palladium (column 4, lines 54-57).

Reid et al is directed to a process for electroplating a metal layer onto a semiconductor wafer. Reid teaches that nonuniform deposition resulting from the "terminal effect" may be overcome by first plating with a relatively low current until the resistive drop is negligible, and then increasing the current to improve the plating rate. See the abstract.

The Shue et al patent is directed to the electrochemical deposition of copper metallurgy on an integrated circuit. The deposition is performed in two stages. In the first stage a low current density which provides good coverage is used. After a brief dwell period wherein the plating current is stopped, a high current density is applied to fill the contacts/vias at a high deposition rate. See the abstract.

The Lowenheim text discloses a process for plating on nonconductors. A thin conductive layer is initially formed on the substrate. Since the conductivity of this

Art Unit: 1741

layer is low, electroplating is started at a low current density until a fair thickness of electrodeposit is built up, and then a higher current density is used. See page 418.

The prior art of record is indicative of the level of skill of one of ordinary skill in the art. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to have deposited a noble metal such as platinum using an electroplating apparatus and method such as that disclosed by Jorne et al because platinum is recognized as an equivalent to copper as shown by Inoue et al or used as a capping layer for copper as shown by Farooq et al, and to have used a low current density for a first period of time followed by a higher current density for a second period of time as taught by Reid et al, Shue et al, and Lowenheim because a better filling of surface features and more uniform deposition without burning the initial conductive seed layer would have been obtained.

Claims 16-19 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorne et al (6,132,587) in view of Inoue et al (5,556,814) or Farooq et al (5,549,808), and further in view of Reid et al (6,074,544), Shue et al (6,140,241) or the Lowenheim text, *Electroplating* as applied to claims 15 and 20 above, and additionally in view of Ting et al (6,077,412) and Young et al (4,705,606).

Art Unit: 1741

Claims 16, 17 and 19 relate to a step of prerinsing while claims 32-34 relate to a step of precleaning. The Ting et al patent is directed to apparatus and method for electrolytically processing a wafer. Ting et al disclose that the wafer can be washed and dried within processing chamber 10 prior to introduction of the electrolyte (column 13, lines 46-48). During rinsing and drying cycles, the wafer is spun at a relatively high rpm (column 14, lines 13-17). Deionized water may be used (column 14, lines 17-19). Ting et al does not specify that in the cleaning step, an acidic solution should be used as recited in claims 17 and 34. The Young et al patent is directed to a process for depositing metallic interconnections for integrated circuits on a semiconductor wafer and discloses the use of acid in preliminary cleaning. See the surface preparation section of column 3. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to have precleaned a semiconductor substrate prior to plating by contacting with water or an acidic solution to have removed contaminants as taught by Ting et al and Young et al. Instant claim 18 recites removing excess plating solution by spinning. While Ting et al disclose the use of spinning to remove liquid from the wafer being treated, plating solution is not specifically mentioned. However, since Ting et al shows that spinning is effective to remove liquid, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that spinning would have been effective in removing excess plating solution.

Art Unit: 1741

Claims 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorne et al (6,132,587) in view of Inoue et al (5,556,814) or Farooq et al (5,549,808), and further in view of Reid et al (6,074,544), Shue et al (6,140,241) or the Lowenheim text, *Electroplating* as applied to claims 15 and 20 above, and additionally in view of Abys (4,427,502) and Dubin et al (5,972,192).

Claims 21-26 relate to process parameters used in the electrodeposition of platinum. The Abys patent is directed to a process for electroplating platinum and platinum alloys. The platinum concentration ranges from 0.005 molar to saturation (column 4, lines 40-41). This range includes the range recited in instant claim 21. The pH is preferably within the range of 10 to 12.5 (column 3, lines 53-57). This range includes the range of 11-12 recited in claim 24. Abys discloses that a preferred temperature range is 50 to 70°C. This range falls within the range of 40-80°C recited in claim 22. Abys discloses the use of a broad current range (column 4, lines 43-45) but does not specify that pulsed current should be used. Dubin et al disclose that pulse current as recited in instant claim 25 may advantageously be used in electroplating into the surface features of a semiconductor wafer. See the abstract. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to have utilized a platinum plating bath and plating parameters as disclosed by Abys to metallize a semiconductor wafer because these parameters are effective in depositing platinum, and to have used pulsed current as disclosed by Dubin et al

Art Unit: 1741

because it is effective in filling surface features of a semiconductor wafer. Choice of current density would have been a matter of routine optimization within the skill of the ordinary worker in the art.

Claims 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorne et al (6,132,587) in view of Inoue et al (5,556,814) or Farooq et al (5,549,808), and further in view of Reid et al (6,074,544), Shue et al (6,140,241) or the Lowenheim text, *Electroplating* as applied to claims 15 and 20 above, and additionally in view of Lowenheim and Dubin.

Claims 27-31 relate to process parameters used in the deposition of platinum. Lowenheim discloses a number of different electroplating baths for the deposition of platinum (page 300). Bath "S" has a pH of 2 which falls within the range recited in instant claim 27. The platinum concentration of this bath is 5 g/l which falls within the range recited in instant claim 28. Lowenheim does not specify the use of pulsed current. Dubin et al disclose that pulse current as recited in instant claim 29 may advantageously be used in electroplating into the surface features of a semiconductor wafer. See the abstract. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to have utilized a platinum plating bath and plating parameters as disclosed by Lowenheim to metallize a semiconductor wafer because these parameters are effective in depositing platinum, and to have used pulsed

Art Unit: 1741

current as disclosed by Dubin et al because it is effective in filling surface features of a semiconductor wafer. Choice of current density would have been a matter of routine optimization within the skill of the ordinary worker in the art.

This is a CPA of applicant's earlier Application. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1741

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Leader, whose telephone number is (703) 308-2530. The examiner can normally be reached Mondays-Fridays from 7:30 AM to 3:30 PM eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathryn Gorgos can be reached at (703) 308-3328. The fax phone number for *official* after final faxes is (703) 872-9311. The fax phone number for all other *official* faxes is (703) 872-9310. Unofficial communications to the Examiner should be faxed to (703) 305-7719.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

WV

William Leader:wtl
September 7, 2001


Kathryn Gorgos
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700